REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration is requested of the rejection of claims 15–17 on the grounds of the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-3, 8, 11-13, 19, and 22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,461,563.

A terminal disclaimer, and the associated fee, are attached to this response. Examiner's additional reasons for rejecting claims 15-17 are discussed below.

Reconsideration is requested of all rejections based on 35 U.S.C. 112:

As currently amended, reference is no longer made to separating parts without damaging them, rendering this rejection moot.

Reconsideration is requested of all rejections based on 35 U.S.C. 103:

Reference to being unable to separate parts without damaging them has been replaced by referring to the parts in question as being "bonded to one another with an adhesive strength that is attainable through being in contact during a sintering process". We make the following comments regarding this new wording.

(a) We have not defined "bonded", "adhesive strength", or "contact". They are not explicitly defined in the specification nor are they regarded as terms of art. Consequently, the MPEP (section 2111.01) requires examiner to give these words (and others like them) their plain meaning.

(b) The adhesive strength that we claim is supported by the specification since it is taught there that the articles in question were subjected to a sintering

process while in contact with one another.

(c) Comment (b) above notwithstanding, we do not claim that the parts in question derive their bonding strength from sintering, only that said bonding strength is
the same as what can be attained as a result of sintering while in contact with one another.

With regard to JP '804, that invention teaches heating to a temperature higher than the sintering temperature of the system that is being processed and further requires that at least one material of that system be caused to melt. Our claims, as now amended, teach materials that adhere with a bonding strength that is the same as if they had been sintered while in contact, not a temperature higher than this, nor do they teach bonding that would be comparable to what would be achieved if melting had occurred.

Both Wentorf Jr. and Engelfriet's structures teach bodies in which there are one or more materials present at the interfaces between the major components.

In Wentorf's structure there is a layer of cement between the various parts that make up the claimed structure. Engelfriet's structure is formed by press fitting. There is thus a film of air between the various parts that make up the claimed structure.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

SAILE ACKERMAN LLC
28 Davis Avenue
Poughkeepsie
NY 12603